

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-36 and 42-46 are pending in the present application, Claims 32-36 having been amended, Claims 42-46 having been added by the present amendment. Support for the amendments to Claims 32-36, and new Claims 42-46 is found at least in Figs. 5, 10C, 13, and 15, and in the specification on pages 86-90, for example. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 32-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Lenihan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,169,843, hereinafter Lenihan) in view of Yamauchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,103, hereinafter Yamauchi).

Claims 32-36 are each amended to recite, *inter alia*,

a management area, located at an area other than said data area, configured to store management information of the stream object, wherein,

said management information, which is configured to control when the stream object is to be displayed or reproduced, includes an area configured to store first copy management information of the stream object.

Lenihan and Yamauchi do not teach or suggest at least these elements of Claims 32-36.

Applicants acknowledge that the outstanding Office Action correctly states that Lenihan “fails to particularly disclose copy management data, which is a form of management data.”<sup>1</sup> The outstanding Office Action relies on Yamauchi to cure the deficiencies of Lenihan. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Yamauchi does not cure the deficiencies of Lenihan for at least the reasons provided below.

Fig. 2 of Yamauchi discloses CGMS control data contained in a sector of the data-recorded region. Fig. 2b shows that the CGMS control data and the user data are located at the same sector, which is the data area. Claims 32-36 are amended to clarify that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action, mailed May 17, 2005, page 4.

management area is located in an area other than the data area. Thus, because the CGMS control data in Yamauchi is in the data area, Yamauchi does not describe or suggest first copy management information of the stream object included in the management area, which is located in an area other than the data area.

Furthermore, the sector shown in Fig. 2b of Yamauchi should not be interpreted as a management area because it does not store any management information. As the amendment to Claim 32 clarifies, the management area should include “management information, which is configured to control when the stream object is to be displayed or reproduced.”

In addition, Claims 32-36 are each amended to recite “said second data unit, stored in the at least one stream data unit, includes second copy management information indicating a copyright state of the information of the transport stream packet.” Yamauchi only describes one kind of copy management information, CGMS control data in the sector or sectors. Yamauchi does not describe or suggest managing copyright of user data in the sector or sectors by two different kinds of copy management information.

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 32-36 (and Claims 42-46) patentably distinguish over the Lenihan and Yamauchi, alone or in combination.

Application No. 09/808,240

Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2005

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Scott A. Mckeown  
Registration No. 42,866

I:\ATTY\JW\204331US\204331US\_AM DUE 8-17-05.DOC